<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 8-10 have been cancelled and claims 11-17 added to more clearly define the present invention. No new matter has been added.

Claims 8-10 rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 101 have been cancelled.

Original claims 1-10 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,950,980 to Malcolm in view of U.S. 6,901,431 to Dodrill.

In this rejection, the Examiner states that Malcolm teaches a communication method between a network client (Figure 1 client 102) and a network server (server 110), wherein a network document requested by the network client from the network server to the network client is displayed by a browser of the network client to a user for processing (Col 3 lines 16-20, web page are retried by a user to display on client browser), the method comprising recording and storing all changes and supplements to the network document carried out by the user on the network client via software (Col 2 lines 17-23, user specific data submitted by a user to the web page are stored and recorded), when the network document is loaded again by the user, restoring the network document on the basis of the stored user-specific data (see Col 2 lines 13-44).

The Examiner acknowledges that Malcolm does not teach the user-specific data are stored in the network server, and where the changes to layout and embedding of a document page into an entire context, the changes and supplement being stored as a user-specific data and back to Dodrill as a teaching that user-specific data are stored in the network proxy server (Col 7 lines 52-61 XML document modified with user input are stored in application server 66), and where the user input including changes to layout and embedding of a document page into an entire context, the changes and supplement being stored as user-specific data (Col 8 lines 21-43).

The Examiner then concludes that it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of storing user-specific data in the network server of Dodrill in Malcolm such that to have user-specific data in

the server both Dodrill and Malcolm teaches object in XML format storing and retrievals in a network system.

In response thereto, the Applicant submits that Malcolm discloses storing of user-specific data via software in a volatile memory system (DRAM) 14 of a client system 102 to prevent a user from re-entering and re-submitting data filled in a form when the form is loaded again. Malcolm points out several times that user-specific data are form data, e.g. name, address, phone number and e-mail address, of individual input fields of a HTML-page without any reference to the remaining HTML-page (see for example claim 1 and column 2, lines 14 to 40, column 3, lines 4 to 34 and column 4, lines 1 to 36). Column 4, lines 18 to 36 describes in HTML-code that the data are form data.

Therefore, as hereinabove noted, the Examienr has acknowledged that *"Malcom does not teach the user-specific data are stored in the network server and where the changes including changes to layout and embedding of the document page into an entire context, the changes and supplement being stored as user-specific data"*.

In contrast to the Office Action (page 4, 1st paragraph) Dodrill does not teach XML documents are modified with user inputs which include changes to layout and embedding of the document page into an entire context.

Dodrill discloses working on the application server with XML. User-specific inputs and data are stored in this XML document. The application server processes the XML document und then generates HTML code which is sent to the browser for displaying (col. 7, lines 42-51: *„ The application server 66 is configured for parsing an existing XML document ....tag data, that specify application parameters into entry fields of an HTML based form and **outputting the HTML based form to the browser 56"***). From this description it is clear, that pure HTML and form data are used at the browser.

The XML document is neither transferred to the browser nor analyzed at the browser, but is processed at the application server. Drodrill discloses that personalized (= user-specific) data

in the form of XML are stored on the application server and the user-specific data e.g. layout can be changed by a programmer via a browser-based tool (col. 8, lines 25-28: „*The gateway server 70 provides http access for a browser based XML editor tool 56b......that enables a web programmer to design voice...*"). The user-specific XML documents are changed by the programmer, stored in the application server und then sent to the browser as HTML (col. 8, lines 35-38: „*Hence, the application server 66 executes stored XML applications ...*"). The architecture of Dodrill corresponds to the prior art where form data are processed at the browser and these changes are then evaluated by the server. In Dodrill these changes relate to the contents of the form data.

Dodrill does not disclose that user-specific data are generated **by the user at the browser** and then stored at the application server, as claimed by the present application.

In contrast, according to claim 1 and new independent claim 11, the user-specific data are already recorded in the browser and sent to the server as XML data.

According to the present invention "the total state of a web page which a user has generated through interaction with the network client at an earlier time, can be restored", i.e. „anything that can be created in the web browser and/or modified through program control, can be restored" (page 2, summary of the invention, lines 7 to 10 and 14 to 16).

Instead of storing only form data as in Malcolm, according to the present invention the complete page (fonts, colours, cursor position etc.) is stored. As stated on page 2, 3rd paragraph, the known methods including Malcolm are improved in such a manner that changes to the layout and embedding of the page in the entire contents are stored in addition to naked data ("input data").

The present invention makes it possible to dynamically generate web pages at the network client and to store them on the network server. This is a new concept and neither known nor obvious from Malcolm or Dodrill.

In other words, the idea of the present invention is as follows:

A user changes a web page by inputting data and changing elements of the page like fonts, cursor position etc. All of these user-specific changes are recorded and stored on the network server. In the end a new web page is generated at the client, which is stored in the network server. Each user has its own individual web page. If a web page is loaded again the web page with all stored user-specific data is presented to the user for processing.

In summary, a person skilled in the art would not have been motivated by Malcolm and Dodrill to store all user-specific changes including changes to page layout and embedding of the page in the entire contents, in the network server. Therefore, new claim 1 is neither known nor obvious from Malcolm and Dodrill.

In view of the arguments hereinabove set forth and amendment to the claims, it is submitted that each of the claims now in the application define patentable subject matter not anticipated by the art of record and not obvious to one skilled in this field who is aware of the references of record. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter A. Hackler, Reg. No. 27,792

Attorney of Record

2372 S.E. Bristol, Suite B

Newport Beach, California 92660-0755

(949) 851-5010